

There are four main practices that we feel are at the root of the UAB's issues when it comes to conduct cases involving sexual assault:

1. There is a lack of anti-sexual violence training for Volunteer Board members. This problem was noted in a 2016 review of sexual misconduct procedures that the University of Alberta conducted and yet, almost *3 full years later*, no training practices have been instituted. This means we are failing to meet standards that even a Judicial system-- whose flaws have been well-documented--is currently taking steps to fix.
2. The Code of Student Behaviour currently allows for *de novo* hearings which essentially permits the full re-trying of conduct cases. There is no need for this type of review at the appeals level where the accused should really only be trying to prove one of three things: that not all of the evidence was available, all of the evidence was not adequately considered, or that some bias in the conduct process resulted in heightened sanctions.
3. While students should **absolutely** be entitled to receive representation that adequately provides them with the guidance they need to navigate the often convoluted student conduct process, what you end up with in practice are criminal defense lawyers who are applying an understanding of the Canadian Criminal Code to a distinctly and necessarily *non-criminal* process. This means they are appealing a decision that was made on the grounds of a balance of possibilities by making arguments that the evidence should lead you to be certain that something happened *beyond the shadow of a doubt*. This would be like someone noticing it's raining and putting on a raincoat to go outside only to have someone dump a bucket of water over your head and ask you why you weren't better prepared--YOU WERE VERY PREPARED! FOR. THE. LIGHT. RAIN.
4. Finally, and perhaps most importantly to the work that we do on campus, the current system does not allow for adequate emotional support for survivors, the accused, Board members, or University staff who are subject to this process. This means we are causing serious, unnecessary harm to community members who we care about and none of us should be alright with that.

When you combine all of this together, you end up with a Board of untrained community members hearing a full conduct case--including graphic details of sexual assault--without the appropriate emotional support, in a room full of legal professionals who are applying a legal understanding to a *distinctly and necessarily* non-criminal

process. And all of this makes perfect sense because we have set up the conditions for exactly this kind of situation to exist. So let's change that.